

and situations in China are worse today than they were when we adopted this policy of so-called constructive engagement.

One might argue that denial of most-favored-nation status is a blunt instrument and is not the best way to achieve our goals, as Senator THOMAS argued a few moments ago. One might argue that. One might argue that we should look at other options, that we should seek other tools, other instruments to convey this message to the Chinese Government. But few, I believe, can stand and say that the current policy of this administration has been anything other than an abject failure.

Some will say that it will be worse if we deny MFN. A person can argue that, but you cannot prove that. What can be demonstrated in all these now many years of MFN is that, rather than responding by expanding trade opportunities and trade relationships with the United States, rather than responding by improving the conditions of the Chinese people, they have responded by a new wave, an unprecedented wave, of repression upon those who would dare to express their own political opinion or their own religious faith. The logic behind the administration's policy of engagement is, No. 1, that it will improve conditions in China. It clearly has not. According to the State Department report, this administration's own report, it has not improved conditions. They have become more deplorable.

Then the administration argues that if we link human rights conditions in China with trade, the result will be that China will be isolated and the United States companies will lose markets and trade opportunities. I think that is interesting. In fact, Bill Clinton, in November 1993, said, "Well, I think, first of all, I think anybody should be reluctant to isolate a country as big as China with the potential China has for good, not only for the 1.2 billion people of China who are enjoying unprecedented and economic growth, but good in the region and good throughout the world. So our reluctance to isolate them is the right reluctance."

So this administration argues that if we link what is going on within China to our trade opportunities with this Nation, this vast nation, that we will isolate them, and that American companies will lose this opportunity for this huge bargain.

Now, how do they argue that? They say that other countries, European countries, for instance, will rush in and fill the vacuum that is left when we pull out. They are probably right. But there is a non sequitur, there is a self-contradiction, in the argument of the administration that we somehow will isolate China and at the same time the other nations will come in and take the trade opportunities that otherwise would be afforded to our companies.

The fact is, and everyone knows it, that less than 2 percent of our world

trade goes to China. Being removed from China will in no way isolate this great vast nation. In fact, it is impossible for us, today, to isolate China. There will be other nations who go in, just as we will find other markets for our products.

But what is just as certain is that denying the privilege of MFN to this Nation, which is so repressive toward its own people and so expansionist in their military policy, by denying MFN, we can send a powerful and meaningful message to the tyrants in Beijing. I know of no other way that we can send that powerful message, and those who favor the extension of MFN, to me, have not yet offered a significant and meaningful alternative.

Now, let me just return to my call for the administration to release this report. I think it is absolutely critical that the House of Representatives have before them that report before they are asked to cast this very important vote next week. The coming MFN vote is not just a vote on trade, Mr. President. It is not just a vote on what we stand for as a nation, though it is very much that kind of a vote. Are we going to stand for anything? Are we still going to represent the last best hope for freedom-loving people in this world, or are we not?

But it is not just a vote on that. It is not just a vote on Chinese military expansionism, though if we have a great national security threat in the decades to come, it will be from China, and it is a vote as to our concern about that expansionism. It is not just a vote on religious persecution in China, though that ought to concern every freedom-loving American. But, Mr. President, it is also a vote on this administration's China policy, a policy that is, I believe, by every measure, flawed and failed.

Mr. President, I believe this administration deserves a vote of no confidence on their China policy. That can best be given by a no vote on extending MFN to China.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, we are going to be taking up hopefully today our DOD authorization bill, I believe at 1 o'clock. Sometimes it is important to look beyond the bill itself.

There are several provisions of this bill that were very critical which were taken out, and one of them was taken out because I think it is certain that the President would have vetoed it, and

it has to do with Bosnia and with our withdrawal from Bosnia. I think it is important that we talk about that a little bit because, while we are taking up our Department of Defense reauthorization bill, I can tell you right now it is not adequate. It is the very best that we could come up with, with the resources we had to work with, but as chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I can assure you that it is not adequate. We are really at a critical time right now, and, quite frankly, I hang this one on the administration. This has been a very non-military, nondefense administration. We have had a difficult time getting any attention to our military, for the duties that they are trained to perform.

I would like just for a moment to cover a couple of things and how this is going to affect our DOD authorization bill for this year and probably next year, too.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Readiness, we have jurisdiction over training, over military construction, over all readiness issues including the BRAC process. As I have traveled around to various installations, I have found that we are really in serious trouble. I have never been so proud of our troops for doing what they are doing under adverse conditions.

I was a product of the draft many years ago. I came here believing in compulsory service, and I still think it is a good idea for our Nation. However, I am so impressed with the quality of troops we have in this all-voluntary military. However, I wonder how long they can hold on the way they are going right now with this "Optempo" rate. "Optempo" is a term that is used in the military that refers to the number of deployment days, the number of days that these troops are away from their wives, husbands, and families, and it has gone up now in some areas double the amount that is considered to be the optimum. For example, we normally talk about approximately 115 days a year, and it is up now to well over 200 in many areas. While seemingly they are holding on, they are dedicated, you cannot expect it to continue indefinitely because our divorce rate is starting to go up right now and our retention rate is starting to drop right now.

The quality-of-life issues are really a very serious problem. I think both the chairman and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Personnel—Senator DIRK KEMPTHORNE and Senator MAX CLELAND—are doing a great job, but I assure you when you are talking about readiness, the personnel issues and the quality-of-life issues are very, very significant.

Going back in time just a little bit, I can remember being here on the Senate floor back in November 1995 when we found out that the President of our country, Bill Clinton, was proposing to send troops over to Bosnia. I got to

thinking at that time, are we going to go through this same exercise again? Right now, we have more troops deployed in more parts of the world than we have had at any time since World War II, and yet they are not over there for any purposes that relate to our Nation's security. Our strategic security interests are not being served. They call them peacekeeping missions. They call them peacemaking missions. They call them humanitarian missions.

Mr. President, with the scarce resources that we have right now—and, of course, you know because you serve on the Senate Armed Services Committee—we cannot continue to do this.

I can remember the debate that took place on this floor in November 1995 when the President was suggesting that we send troops over to the northeastern sector of Bosnia, and I remember going over there and seeing what it was like and seeing what our mission would be like, and supposedly we were going to go over there to make peace, to draw the lines out so that we would have these lines of demarcation where the Serbs had to be over here and the Croats had to be here and the Muslims had to be here, forgetting all about the fact that there are many other factions there. I do not think it is even a remote possibility we could stop the Serbs, Croats, and Muslims from fighting with each other. They have been doing it for 500 years.

Let us assume we could. If we could, we still have the Mujaheddin, Arkan Tigers, Black Swans—we have all these rogue elements, and the only thing they have in common is they hate us. Here we are sending troops, proposing at that time in 1995 to send troops over when we have been sending them other places.

I remember—and I am not hanging this one on President Clinton because it was President Bush who initially sent troops into Somalia, and he sent them over in September, before he was defeated and before the new Clinton administration took over. They originally were sent over for 45 days. Each month—and you and I were both serving in the other body at that time. We passed a resolution calling for the withdrawal of our troops from Somalia because they were spending our precious defense dollars and they were endangering their lives. And month after month after month President Clinton said, we are going to leave them over there indefinitely. And it wasn't until 18 of our Rangers were brutally murdered and their nude corpses dragged through the streets of Mogadishu that finally the American people woke up and applied enough pressure, and we were able to bring back our troops. I do not want that to happen in the streets of Sarajevo. I do not want that to happen in Bosnia.

But if you will remember, Mr. President, it was in November when they were trying to sell the idea of having the support of Congress to send our troops over there, we had a resolution

of disapproval saying we can't afford to do it. We were not without compassion. We were not unconcerned about the plight of those poor people over there. But that has been going on for many, many years. The problem was we just could not afford another mission like that, and so we had a resolution of disapproval. And the President and the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. John Shalikashvili, said that they would be over there for only 12 months. They go over in December, come back in December of the following year.

That was 1996. Well, anyway, this was not just approximately 12 months. This was not simply a suggestion that maybe we can get our mission, whatever our mission was—I still don't know what our mission was over here—maybe we can get that mission accomplished in 12 months. It was an absolute promise by this administration, and I have it down in the words of Secretary of Defense Bill Perry that they said this is an absolute, there are no conditions under which our troops will be there beyond 12 months. I knew it wasn't true. They lied to the American people.

We missed passing a resolution of disapproval, Mr. President, by four votes—four votes. I can remember several, at least four people standing on the floor of the Senate saying, well, it is only for 12 months, because that was an absolute at that time. We said it was not going to be 12 months.

I went to Bosnia. Nobody had been over there at that time. Sure, they were firing guns and all of that, and I wanted to go up to the northeast sector because the northeast sector of Bosnia is where we were going to send our troops, we were proposing to do it at that time. That's where Tuzla is, Brcko, up in that northeastern sector. I went up there. In fact, I wasn't able to get up there any other way, so I borrowed a British helicopter and went up to the Tuzla area and landed up there only to find that there were some troops up there that were U.N. troops, not American troops, and the commanding general of the northeast sector was a guy named Haukland from Norway, a great guy.

So I went in there. I said, "I hear gunfire out there." "Yeah, it's been going on for a long time. It's still going on." I said, "Well, you know, we are proposing to send troops over here and have this joint effort to cause the divisions to stop the fighting up here." I said, "Of course, it is only going to be 12 months." And he started laughing. He said, "Twelve months. You mean 12 years." He said, "It is different here than it is most other places."

This is the analogy that he drew. I have mentioned it in this Chamber before, but it is so accurate today to remember. We knew this in November 1995. He said, "It's like putting your hand in water and leaving it for there 12 months. Then you take it out and nothing has changed. It is the same."

I would suggest to you, Mr. President, that when we pull out ultimately—and I hope we can do it safely, I hope that we can have a minimum of terrorist activity at that time, but we know that they are just in a period of rest right now and they will go right back. This is the dilemma we find ourselves in. The President promised we would be out in 12 months. He broke his promise, and we were not out. Then he said we are not going to stay 18 months beyond the 12 months, so June 30, 1998, would be the withdrawal date.

I have to say that the President has us, those of us who are conservatives, those of us who are for a strong national defense—and I have to say in a not too charitable way that we have a lot of Members of this body that sincerely in their hearts are not all that concerned about our Nation's defense because they don't think there is a significant threat out there. How many times have you heard from this administration that the cold war is over and so there is no longer a threat. And I said before, I look back wistfully at the days of the cold war when we had one opposition, we had two superpowers, and the other one was the U.S.S.R. and intelligence knew pretty much what they had, what kind of resources they had; they were predictable in what they were doing. They were people you could predict. Now, we are faced with a world environment where we have, admittedly, and it is not even classified, over 25 nations that currently, today, have weapons of mass destruction, either biological, chemical or nuclear. And they are working on the means to deliver them.

Just in yesterday's Washington Times there was an article about how now China is working on a joint project on a missile with Iran. Is Iran a friend? No. All these people talking about how friendly China is, yet we know that both China and Russia have a missile that would deliver a weapon of mass destruction from any place in the world to the continental United States. That is there today. We know that. It is logical, if we also know—again, it is not even classified—that both Russia and China are selling and have sold both systems and technology to countries like Iran and other countries, then why would they stop at this fine line, this bright line, you might say, and say they are not going to sell them a missile that would reach the continental United States? That does not do anything for my comfort level. Nonetheless, we are involved in a situation in Bosnia right now where the President has said we are going to extend it to June of 1999.

Then I keep hearing whispers from these people who do not see any threat out there, "That's all right, when that time comes, when June gets here, we are going to go ahead and extend it for another 6 months, and another 6 months." I can tell you right now, Mr. President, there are people in this Chamber and people in the White

House who have no intentions of any kind of withdrawal from Bosnia. So I serve notice, as I have many times and as have other Members, when that date gets here you better be ready because we are going to be pulling out.

I think it is going to be necessary to be talking about this between now and through the entire next year, so they can be prepared. We do have NATO allies. We do not want to be insensitive to the fact that a lot of our NATO allies have strategic interests in keeping troops in Bosnia. Those people in the Balkans, those in the eastern part of Europe that are our allies in NATO, they certainly have reason to want to have peace in Bosnia because it serves their strategic interests. We are across an ocean. It does not serve ours. While we would like to have the luxury, we are faced with a depleted, almost a decimated, military in this country. We are in a position where we cannot meet the minimum expectations of the American people, which is to be able to defend America on two regional fronts. We know we cannot do that. Let's not kid anybody, we know we could not fight the Persian Gulf war again, even if we wanted to today. We do not have the resources to do that.

It is not just that we do not have a national missile defense system, it is conventional forces, too. We have approximately one half the force strength that we had in 1991. I am talking about one half the Army divisions, one half the Air Force wings, one half the boats that are floating around out there. Yet people think we are in a position to adequately defend ourselves.

So, I think we need to think of this problem that we have around the world and specifically in Bosnia in terms of, No. 1, what it is doing to our overall defense system in terms of money and personnel. If we should have to call our troops in for something in North Korea and simultaneously for something perhaps in Iran or the Middle East, we would be in a position of having to retrain these troops that have been sent to Somalia or Haiti or Bosnia or one of the other places, all these missions we are sending them on, because the rules of combat are different. There is not a general out there who would not tell you we would have to retrain our troops. That would take time, that would cost money, and that directly affects our state of readiness.

But what else? There was another promise that was made back in November 1995, and that is we would send our troops over there and this whole mission, this 12-month mission, would cost between \$1.5 and \$2 billion. It is all in the RECORD. That is what they said. It was repeated here on the Senate floor. "It is not going to be that expensive. It's going to be between \$1.5 and \$2 billion." At that time, on the Senate floor—and it is in the RECORD—I said it is going to end up costing \$8 billion before it is over. And guess what, we are now going through \$6.5 billion.

There are four elements of a defense system that we can control. We cannot

control these missions because the White House has control over these missions. But what we can control are readiness, troop force strength, quality of life, and modernization. Those are the four elements that we can control. When we now are down to the point where we have an optempo of almost double what is considered to be the acceptable level and we have the troops that are deployed in all these places where there are no strategic interests at risk, we are spending that money over there for these missions that has to come out of the defense budget.

The other day we had a committee meeting. We had all four chiefs of the services. I asked each one of them, one at a time, I said, "We are going to come in for an emergency supplemental. We are going to have to nickel and dime this thing and pay for all this fun we are having over in these areas and all this good we are supposedly doing. It is going to have to come out of defense somewhere. You have four choices: readiness, troop strength, modernization, or quality of life. Where is it going to come from?" Not one—finally the Marine general said, "I'd say quality of life, because we are tough." So maybe that was the only answer that we got.

But there is no way we can take it out of quality of life and still retain people. Right now in this authorization bill, by the way, we have money that is in there for flight hours, which is very critical because we are losing our trained pilots. It costs \$87,000 just to go through primary training for one of these pilots. What we are doing is training them for the airlines, because we are losing them. We cannot compete. We don't have to be able to pay the same money the airlines pay, but we have to be able at least to have a respectable level of optempo and be competitive, so we do have some money for flight hours in this authorization bill. Again, to do that we have to take it from someplace else. I, as chairman of the readiness subcommittee, can tell you I am not at all comfortable with our state of readiness as it is right now.

I believe we should have in the authorization bill—and I had an amendment ready but decided, since it would be certain it would draw a veto, that we would handle this as a separate issue—but we need actually to have a resolution of withdrawal, giving our commitment to make sure our NATO allies know and can prepare today for our withdrawal on June 30, 1998.

I went to Brussels where they had the last NATO meeting and made a speech there making it abundantly clear. I found at the same time I made a statement which I feel I can make on behalf of the U.S. Senate, there were other people who were walking around whispering, saying, "Don't worry, we will not leave you high and dry."

I am very much concerned. Normally we do not address these things until it gets hysterical around here. But rather

than to wait to that point, I am going to say right now, a year ahead of time, that we have enough people in this body and the body down the hall who are going to stop the effort to extend beyond the June 30 deadline for our troops remaining in the former Yugoslavia. As I say, there are two reasons for it. One is our state of readiness that is suffering as a result of it. And the second thing is the risk of the people and the cost of that risk. That cost, that \$6.5 to \$8 billion it is going to cost us, is going to have to come out of somewhere, out of our defense budget.

The last thing I would say that is impaired by this, this issue we have talked about many times, is the fact we need to finish our national missile defense system that we started in 1983. In 1983—of course, that was the Reagan administration. There were a lot of people at that time who were very, very—they were very concerned over what was going to happen. They had the foresight to say we are going to have to have a system to defend America against a missile that would come in, an ICBM, by the year 2000. So we set up a system whereby we would have something deployable by 1999.

Up until 1992, when the Clinton administration went in, we were right on schedule. We had an investment. We have a \$50 billion investment in the Aegis fleet of 22 ships right now that have rocket-launching capabilities. You can stand on the floor and talk about the four different types of potential systems that we now have an investment in that would offer us a defense against a missile attack from overseas, but perhaps the Aegis system is the best one because it is a matter of protecting an investment, a \$50 billion investment. It would only cost \$5 billion more to be able to take the launching capability and go out of the atmosphere.

Why is that important? Because if a missile is launched from China or from North Korea or from Russia—and certainly don't assume something couldn't come from Russia. It could be an accidental launch. We know that. We went through that. When we had the hearings not too long ago, we talked about how long it took to retarget over there and what the risk was of an accidental launch or an unintentional launch from Russia. But if that happened, if we have this system in place where we can go up beyond the atmosphere, we would have about 30 minutes to shoot down a missile that is coming in our direction. We know it works. There is not anyone in America who did not watch on CNN what was going on in the Persian Gulf war. We know that rockets can knock down missiles. So it is a matter of getting it out of the atmosphere.

If you wait until it comes into the atmosphere, you have about 2 minutes. So the choice there is 30 minutes or 2 minutes. When you have a system that is 90 percent paid for and it takes about \$5 billion more and we are spending \$6

or \$8 billion over in Bosnia, we have to get our priorities straight. Unfortunately, we have a very biased media in this country that does not allow a lot of this stuff to get out.

We can say it on the floor of the U.S. Senate and we know that we have the facts. But by the time it gets reported, it shifts through the beltway media and people do not realize that risk is out there.

So I will just say, Mr. President, since we are dealing with the DOD authorization bill today, I would like to serve warning we are going to have a resolution, well in advance, so our allies will know that when June 30, 1998, comes, we are going to be out of Bosnia. I think it is better to go ahead and serve notice early rather than to wait to the last minute.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. BOND pertaining to the introduction of S. 938 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. FAIRCLOTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

EDUCATION TAX CREDIT

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, I rise to speak on education, particularly vocational education.

This past January, I introduced, with Senator CRAIG, S. 50, which provides a \$1,500 tax credit for students at vocational and technical schools and community colleges. S. 50, today, has the support of 11 other Members, including the majority leader.

Recently, the tax credit for vocational training found a place in Senator ROTH's budget reconciliation package.

The provision provides a 75-percent tax credit for up to \$2,000 in expenses at a community college. Now, for the average student spending around \$1,500 in annual tuition and books, that amounts to a \$1,125 tax credit. I would like to thank Senator ROTH for his support of vocational training in the budget package.

Under the House budget package, a student would only receive a 50-percent credit for up to \$3,000. That amounts to \$1,500 for a 4-year student. But for community college students, who are generally of a lower income and are holding jobs while they are in school, it

would only amount to \$750 or less. I think it is fortunate that the Senate recognizes this and is going to allow a 75-percent tax credit for up to \$2,000.

I believe that we should give every adult American the opportunity to obtain the training needed to find employment. In fact, we are demanding that they work, so it is incumbent upon us to give them the opportunity to be trained to work. Most any job that a person would look at today requires some training, and the community college is the place to do it. This tax credit will enable the students to go.

A tax credit for community college students will encourage workers in all age brackets to pursue an education beyond high school without incurring the expensive cost of attending a 4-year college. By improving the training and skills of our workers, we will create a better job climate and a better manufacturing and technological society.

As State commerce secretary for North Carolina, I was able to bring more than 500,000 jobs into the State, and practically all of them required additional training or retraining. By strengthening the community college system and offering custom training for workers in a specific skill for the last 8 years, North Carolina has been among the top three States in new plant locations. We have been able to develop a film industry that brings \$2.5 billion a year to my State. The answer to economic growth is to be able to train people, and the community college system is the only entity I have ever seen that could really train them and put them on the job.

As we begin to see the impact of the changes made to welfare in the last Congress, more and more people are going to be taken off welfare and they must work, and we must train them if they are going to work.

Many people who go to the community colleges are going back for retraining. They are not studying to get an entirely new degree. People are expected to keep up with new technology, and industry is demanding that they do. The tax credit will allow these individuals to receive training so they can quickly return to the work force.

Again, I want to thank Senator ROTH for his support, as well as the 11 Senators that have helped me to bring this bill to this point. I certainly hope we will retain the 75-percent credit as the package moves through the process and through the conference.

I thank the Chair.

LEADERSHIP TRAINING INSTITUTE FOR YOUTH

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I would like to point out a remarkable program that exists in America today—a program that infuses our young people with a sense of purpose, values, principles, and the capacity to get things done.

This program, called the Leadership Training Institute for Youth, is doing

its good work at Southwest Baptist University in Bolivar, MO, this week.

Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to this organization and its dedicated staffers and participants. It is Missouri's distinct honor to host such an excellent opportunity for our young people.

The Leadership Training Institute for Youth is a model initiative that, with the help of Scripture and sound guidance, teaches young people the tenets of good leadership and good citizenship.

Of course, the core training for tomorrow's leaders begins at home, and this organization and its committed staffers build on the lessons that parents teach.

The Leadership Training Institute for Youth provides young people across the country with opportunity, inspiration, and advantage in our culture. It calls future leaders to their highest and best in the name of a higher power. It offers direction in what is too often a rudderless world.

The institute demonstrates through lessons and example the value of priorities such as love for God, family, and country. It motivates youth to esteem virtues of honor, morality, compassion, faithfulness, integrity, discipline, and respect for the sanctity of life.

Therefore, I rise today to express my sincere appreciation to the Leadership Training Institute for Youth. Without such entities, our children might be left to the mercies of today's malls, movies, and televisions.

Our national heritage and our country's future are too important to be left to today's suspect environments that typically attract our young people.

The Leadership Training Institute for Youth is a commitment to our young people—a commitment to the future leaders of this great Nation. We need more programs like it.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, June 18, 1997, the Federal debt stood at \$5,332,271,639,188.30. (Five trillion, three hundred thirty-two billion, two hundred seventy-one million, six hundred thirty-nine thousand, one hundred eighty-eight dollars and thirty cents)

One year ago, June 18, 1996, the Federal debt stood at \$5,118,201,000,000. (Five trillion, one hundred eighteen billion, two hundred one million)

Five years ago, June 18, 1992, the Federal debt stood at \$3,932,881,000,000. (Three trillion, nine hundred thirty-two billion, eight hundred eighty-one million)

Ten years ago, June 18, 1987, the Federal debt stood at \$2,293,249,000,000. (Two trillion, two hundred ninety-three billion, four hundred forty-nine million)

Fifteen years ago, June 18, 1982, the Federal debt stood at \$1,069,337,000,000